

LG-CSCI

Pre-Solicitation
Conference
Q&A

April 25th and 26th 2017

Enterprise Hill Commodity Council

Contents

Disclaimer.....	3
SMALL BUSINESS.....	3
IUID	3
CONTRACT STRUCTURE	3
PRICING/PAYMENT	3
DATA/DOCUMENTS/SYSTEM ACCESS.....	5
FORGINGS	5
FIRST ARTICLE TESTING/TEST FACILITIES	5
GENERAL QUESTIONS/MISCELLANEOUS	6
OTD/PLT	7
FORECASTING/INFORMATION EXCHANGE	7
DCMA	8
RFP	8
SOURCE SELECTION.....	8
TDP	9

Disclaimer

All answers are given based on the strategy and information available at the time of the answer being provided. Although significant changes are not anticipated, all answers are subject to change until the formal RFP is released.

SMALL BUSINESS

- 1) Does the Government expect teaming?

Yes, when we conducted our market research we determined that a group of small businesses could support this effort so we anticipate that teaming will be required. However, teaming is not mandatory.

IUID

- 1) Does the IUID requirement need to be put in the database? Will the Contractor be utilizing the IUID database? What kind of data will the Contractor need to submit?

The IUID requirement has been adjusted, explaining that the Government requires a parts tracking repository, not an information database. The information that needs to be included in the data repository is defined in the latest version of TRD 4.7.

CONTRACT STRUCTURE

- 1) Contractor will need to purchase parts and material ahead of time in order to achieve lower lead times and achieve on time delivery. How will the Government ensure items will not go tactical?

For LG-CSCI the Commodity Council will screen Purchase Requests in order to ensure they are being directed to the strategic contract identified on for the NSN, attempts to buy around will be identified and flagged. In addition, if the contractor meets the level of support required by the LG-CSCI contract, the temptation, or need for offices to buy around this effort will not exist.

PRICING/PAYMENT

- 1) Will progress payments be made available?

Government financing is a last case scenario, but Progress payment provisions will be included for completed forgings, and only on an order by order basis with the approval of the CO.

- 2) Would there be a buy back clause for the Contractor to sell inventory back to the Government at the end of the contract, based on inventories and document changes through the contract?

There will not be a buyback clause. The Government may only purchase items for which there is a bona-fide need. The intent is that as partners, the contractor and Government will forecast these parts together so that a buyback is not necessary.

- 3) Will there be a price adjustment when there is a spec change? Is there going to be a change clause to the contract to accommodate this?

Yes, there will be a "Changes" clause included in the contract.

- 4) Does the Government intend to make orders based on the proposed prices in the TEP?

Yes, the prices proposed in the TEP will be contractually binding and orders will be placed based on the price associated with the quantity ordered.

- 5) Will items be added to this program in the future?

We have included every item that fits within our scope today. The Priced list contains all of the items that we know we will buy in the next ten years, and the Add list contains the items that meet our scope, but may not have current demands. Outside of that, any additions would have to meet the scope of our effort and be added via a sole source J&A.

- 6) Fixing prices for 10 years presents a lot of risk on the Contractor's behalf.

We understand that there is risk inherent in this pricing structure, and Offerors will have to attribute that risk to their proposal as they see fit. However, there will be an EPA clause that will alleviate the risk of substantial material cost increases or decreases. We have also included quantity range pricing for each contract year to help alleviate the pricing risk as well.

- 7) There appear to be some BEQs that don't make sense, can the Government please take another look at these?

Yes, the Government will review all BEQs prior to formal solicitation.

- 8) Does the BEQ include FMS requirements?

Yes, and FMS requirements are unplanned for, so collaboration for these types of orders will be important to identify and prepare for them as early in the process as possible.

DATA/DOCUMENTS/SYSTEM ACCESS

- 1) Will the ELLIS tracking database be available for this effort?

Initially we did not think that ELLIS would be available for LG-CSCI, but now it may be. We are still looking into this, unfortunately we will not know prior to solicitation. Regardless of the ELLIS database, the government will have a data tracking tool for delivery order metrics.

FORGINGS

- 1) Who owns the forging dies?

The Government owns the rights to the dies, the Prime Contractor will have the right to use the dies in support of this effort. If dies need to be refurbished it will be the prime's responsibility.

FIRST ARTICLE TESTING/TEST FACILITIES

- 1) Are you going to allow the waiver process for those that have been manufacturing?

The Waiver process will be applied to the Prime Contractor, if their cage code has successfully delivered a first article, then a waiver can be considered. Otherwise a first article will need to be submitted

- 2) When will first article reports be required?

This report will be required after any First Article Test completed at a third party lab. CDRL A001 now clarifies this.

- 3) Can a team member act as the 3rd party lab?

No, they must be a neutral 3rd party.

- 4) Can the FA inspection be done at the Contractor's facility?

No, it must be done at the neutral 3rd party's lab.

- 5) First article testing clause: significant effort for the lab to get adequate pricing without guarantee of the work. Some require form and fit. Some may not need first article and can bid very low on first articles because they know they won't need a first article: Need a set a price from a third party lab.

The Government FAT lab bills to an hourly rate, so there is no list to post for each NSNs FAT price at the Government lab. Offerors will be required to provide a price to using a 3rd party lab. Offeror's proposals will be evaluated for balance, and issues where unit prices for first article tests may be dramatically understated, however any price advantage a company may have due to previous First Article Tests is an unavoidable

incumbent advantage.

- 6) Is there a road map for the third party test lab and EN to solve problems?

This will be based on the Contractor's interaction with the lab and EN. The Contractor PM will have immediate access to the Government EN team and should work with them and the FAT lab to resolve issues. Government EN will still approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove First Article Test reports as they are delivered via CDRL A001. These dispositions will function the same as with using the government FA lab.

- 7) Can there be multiple 3rd party labs?

Yes, the labs just need to be approved by the Government.

GENERAL QUESTIONS/MISCELLANEOUS

- 1) Will the Government incorporate Variation in Quantity (VIQ)?

No, the VIQ clause will not be incorporated into this effort. This Clause may be appropriate in a tactical purchase arena, but the long term, single award strategic nature of LG-CSCI precludes the necessity for VIQ.

- 2) If an NSN doesn't have an EO for HVOF, can the contractor still use Chrome?

Yes, specifically comply with whatever is on the drawings, change orders etc.

- 3) Does the Government anticipate a backlog of orders that will need to be filled in the first year of performance?

We expect normal buying behavior, the Government will continue to purchase Landing Gear spares the way we do today, until the LG-CSCI program is on contract.

- 4) How will the source approval process work?

The Prime Contractor, by virtue of the source selection, will become the qualified source for all parts and it will be up to them to source as they see fit. Due to this change the Prime Contractor will be 100% accountable for the delivery, quality and performance of all NSNs. The Contractor is required to evaluate sources per TRD 4.8.1.

- 5) Does the Government anticipate a rapid transition to the ZN requirement?

Since Cadmium is still an acceptable alternate, offerors should just bid to the TDP. Special references to Zi-Ni have been removed from the solicitation and section L.

- 6) Will there be a transition period after award?

It is expected that the Contractor will be ready to fill orders upon award of the basic contract. There will be a small grace period for metrics while the Program Manager

obtains all of the Air Force Installation access requirements.

- 7) If, during contract performance Cadmium requirements are replaced by ZN, how will the price difference be addressed?

An issue like this would be addressed at the time of order, and the EPA clause would be used if the price difference was significant enough to drive a change IAW the EPA clause.

- 8) Will certificates of conformance be allowed for MS type part numbers?

Yes, COCs will be handled the same way they are today.

OTD/PLT

- 1) OTD penalty? If the Contractor is late for unusual circumstances are we going to have to request a mod?

We do not intend to mod the contract to excuse late delivery. The metric gives a 15 day buffer before the penalty is applied, at which point it is applied exponentially with each day late up to a 10% decrement to the delivery order. If there are extreme circumstances forcing a late delivery the CO will evaluate them on a case by case basis.

- 2) PLT reduction. What is the rationale of 10%? Only getting a better evaluating proposal not better delivery and seems like it could be gamed.

The Air Force PLT definition is driven by AFMCMAN 23-101 volume 4 paragraph 2.3.3. This approach allows us an understanding of how long before we can get parts flowing. For DLA the PLT definition is set for 51% of the delivery. If the Contractor does not meet their PLT it will result in late delivery, which will then be penalized.

- 3) What are the PLT baselines based on?

The PLT is based on the last procurement for the Government, we understand that some of these PLTs are likely very high, but this is an issue that the Government is taking responsibility for and we expect that there will be some easy reductions because of this.

FORECASTING/INFORMATION EXCHANGE

- 1) How do we have insight into forecast and technical documents? If there is a spec change, we can't foresee that.

The Contractor will have access to the databases and information systems that house the technical documents, they will also be given forecast data as soon as it is made available to the Government.

- 2) Does the Government intend to order to the full BEQ, or is this something that the prime will be able to look at?

The BEQ is just an estimate, the Government has to order to a bona-fide need. Yes, the prime will be expected to look at these types of data to improve the forecasts and help the Government purchase to a more accurate need.

DCMA

- 1) Who would be issuing the delegation letters for the inspections? How will DCMA know who the supplier would be?

DCMA Cleveland will most likely be the post award management team, they will issue the letters of delegation to the manufacturers identified by the Prime Contractor after the initial order review with DCMA.

- 2) Since the 339 process has been removed, what is the intended level of interaction between the Program Manager and DCMA?

We expect the Program Manager to be involved in all aspects of the program including interactions with DCMA as much as necessary.

- 3) What will DCMA's role be?

It is recognized that the current QALI does not adequately detail inspection requirements. This is evidenced by the variety of execution that exists with different DCMA QARs. Landing Gear EN is in the process of refining the requirement and issuing a new QALI that should better standardize the requirement, thereby eliminating needless inspections. However, until this can be finalized, it is recommended that the Contractor bid to the current QALI

RFP

- 1) When does the Government anticipate RFP release? And how long will offerors have to propose?

We are hoping to have the solicitation out by 5 May, but we are that this is an extremely aggressive schedule, and are trying to release as soon as possible. We plan on giving Offerors at least a 90-100 day proposal response time.

SOURCE SELECTION

- 1) Section L, 3.7.3 asks the Contractor to define the process for new source. What do you have in mind, since the prime is the source?

The intent of this evaluation element is to ensure the Offeror has an in depth understanding of the source development process within the LG-CSCI supply chain, and

has the ability to appropriately identify, mentor and develop new sources with qualifications necessary to support the AF landing gear supply chain.

- 2) Is the 5 year date for past performance Recency flexible?

For Recency we have to draw a hard line, so efforts that took place more than 5 years from the closing date of the RFP cannot be considered.

- 3) What are the most important elements for the Government?

Section L of the solicitation identifies all of the information that the Government requires of Offerors for proposal purposes. Section M identifies the evaluation method for each of the Factors. Within the Technical Factor there are 4 Sub-factors, and they are listed in descending order of importance. It is crucial that Offerors pay very close attention to sections L&M while building proposals, and it is crucial that Offerors concisely demonstrate capabilities in their Technical Approach.

- 4) Can Offerors submit resumes for more than just the positions that resumes are requested?

There is no prohibition on submitting extra resumes, but the Government would not be able to evaluate them, so it would probably be a waste of proposal space. We can only evaluate what we ask for in section L and provide an evaluation mechanism for in section M.

If there are individuals that an Offeror feels are vital to their proposal, but the Government is not asking for a resume, their roles and responsibilities would need to be included somehow in the technical approach in order to be evaluated.

TDP

- 1) The review of 15 days doesn't seem long enough to look at TDP. Will there be any flexibility?

The Government will be reasonable, however since the Prime Contractor will have the appropriate system access and the Government's forecast data and information about upcoming orders, it is expected that they will proactively review the TDPs and issues should be identified prior to the issuance of the order in most cases.

- 2) Will delivery relief be granted for the time it takes the government to make a decision? Will Delivery relief be granted if the Government is causing the delay.

If the Government is causing delays this will be looked at, but nearly all of the internal processes that currently cause delays have been removed or modified to prevent this.

- 3) Do the Bid-Sets contain all of the items in the TEP worksheet?

No, there are many items that will need to be priced that do not have TDPs associated with them. The Bid-set package contains all of the NSNs in the TEP worksheet that have associated TDPs. If there are any NSNs that have omitted TDPs they will be securely posted to FBO with the formal RFP.

- 4) It is understood that the TDP and bid sets are for the proposal use only. It is at the time of delivery order that the most up to date TDP will be in the systems.

Yes, that is correct.

- 5) How will changes to the TDP be addressed if there are assets that have already been manufactured but have not incorporated changes, or the changes drove an increase in price?

The contractor/Government PM team will be able to see the changes made in real time, and should make sure they are not implemented before items on the shelf are used. There is a waiver ability for some of the items based on the criticality issue. Any changes that drive an increase in cost will be handled via the changes clause, or the EPA clause, depending on the driving factor behind the change and the amount of change.